

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated Senpuku et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0083642) (hereinafter "Senpuku"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim limitation must be found within the cited prior art reference and arranged as required by the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants respectfully assert that Senpuku does not disclose "said second display forming a skin of said data processing device" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 9. The Examiner cites element 3b in Figure 3 of Senpuku as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Senpuku instead discloses that the sub-display device 3b is hidden at the back side of the main display device 3a. [0049]. Senpuku further discloses that the sub-display device 3b has a structure in which it slides relative to a main casing 20, and the user can use the main display device 3a in addition to 3b at the same time. [0049]. Hence, Senpuku discloses that the sub-display device 3b is hidden at the back side of the main display device 3a and that the sub-display device 3b has a structure in which it slides relative to a main casing. There is no language in Senpuku that discloses that the sub-display device 3b forms a skin. Instead, Senpuku discloses that sub-display device 3b is hidden at the back side of the main display device 3a. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 9, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claims 1 and 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "driver circuits coupled to said first and second display devices, wherein corresponding ones of said driver circuits are coupled to said first and second displays, said driver circuits coupled to an output of said graphics engine, and wherein said first and second display devices having disjoint display areas" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner asserts that the above-cited claim limitation is well known in the art. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse. While driver circuits may be known in the art, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that having driver circuits coupled to the first and second display devices, where corresponding ones of the driver circuits are coupled to the first and second displays, where the driver circuits coupled to an output of the graphics engine, and where the first and second display devices having disjoint display areas is well known in the art. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a reference that teaches having driver circuits coupled to the first and second display devices, where corresponding ones of the driver circuits are coupled to the first and second displays, where the driver circuits coupled to an output of the graphics engine, and where the first and second display devices having disjoint display areas. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 1. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Further, in connection with the rejection of the above-cited claim limitation, it appears that the Examiner is tacitly admitting that Senpuku does not teach the above-cited claim limitation. If that is the case, then the Examiner must provide a motivation or suggestion for modifying Senpuku to incorporate the above-cited claim limitation. M.P.E.P. §§2142-2143.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "a first graphics engine for receiving data for generating display signals for said first information from a first frame buffer in a graphics memory" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner cites element 2 in Figure 2 of Senpuku as disclosing the first graphics engine and element 9 in Figure 2 of Senpuku as disclosing a first frame buffer. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that Senpuku discloses the above-cited claim limitation.

The Examiner has not specifically addressed each of the elements in the above-cited limitation. For example, the Examiner has not specifically pointed out which element in Senpuku discloses the graphics memory. Applicants believe that the Examiner meant to assert element 9 of Senpuku as disclosing the graphics memory; however, then the Examiner must specifically point out which element in Senpuku discloses the first frame buffer.

Further, Senpuku instead discloses that the video circuit 2 can independently control the main display device 3a and the sub-display device 3b. [0046]. Senpuku further discloses that the main display device 3a and the sub-display device 3b display images, such as text, still images, and moving pictures, according to control signals from the video circuit 2. [0046]. Senpuku additionally discloses that the memory 9 stores various types of programs and data. [0046]. There is no language in Senpuku that discloses a first graphics engine for receiving data for generating display signals for the first information from a first frame buffer in a graphics memory. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 9, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "a second graphics engine for receiving data for generating display signals for said second information from a second frame buffer in said graphics memory" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner cites element 4 in Figure 2 of Senpuku as disclosing the second frame buffer. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that Senpuku discloses the above-cited claim limitation.

The Examiner has not specifically addressed each of the elements in the above-cited limitation. For example, the Examiner has not specifically pointed out which element in Senpuku discloses the second graphics engine.

Further, Senpuku instead discloses that the video decoder/encoder 4 is a circuit having an encoder that encodes images taken with a camera 5 into compressed data in accordance with an encoding format such as MPEG4. [0046]. There is no language in Senpuku that discloses a second graphics engine for receiving data for generating display signals for the second information from a second frame buffer in

the graphics memory. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 9, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "driver circuits coupled to said first and second display devices, wherein corresponding ones of said driver circuits are coupled to said first and second displays, a first one of said driver circuits coupled to an output of said first graphics engine and a second one of said driver circuits coupled to an output of said second graphics engine, wherein said first and second display devices having disjoint display areas, and said data for generating display signals received from a central processing unit (CPU) in response to a data processing application" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner cites element 1 of Figure 2 and Figure 3 of Senpuku as disclosing the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Senpuku instead discloses that MPU 1 has a function to control operations of each device. [0046]. Senpuku further discloses that Figure 3 is an elevational view of the mobile communications device. [0026]. There is no language in the description of element 1 or in the description of Figure 3 of Senpuku that discloses driver circuits coupled to the first and second display devices. Neither is there any language in the description of element 1 or in the description of Figure 3 of Senpuku that discloses driver circuits coupled to the first and second display devices, where corresponding ones of the driver circuits are coupled to the first and second displays. Neither is there any language in the description of element 1 or in the description of Figure 3 of Senpuku that discloses driver circuits coupled to the first and second display devices, where corresponding ones of the driver circuits are coupled to the first and second displays, a first one of the driver circuits coupled to an output of the first graphics engine and a second one of the driver circuits coupled to an output of the second graphics engine. Neither is there any language in the description of element 1 or in the description of Figure 3 of Senpuku that discloses driver circuits coupled to the first and second display devices, where corresponding ones of the driver circuits are coupled to the first and second displays, a first one of the driver circuits coupled to an output of the first graphics engine and a second one of the driver circuits coupled to an output of the second graphics engine, where the first and second display devices having disjoint display areas, and the data for generating

display signals received from a central processing unit (CPU) in response to a data processing application. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 9, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "receiving a first user selection identifying a first display data source" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "receiving a second user selection identifying a second display data source, said second user selection associated with a user-specified event" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "switching a display skin from said first display source to said second display source in response to an occurrence of the user-specified event" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this

limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Claims 2-8 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 1, and hence claims 2-8 are not anticipated by Senpuku for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Senpuku.

Claims 10-14 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 9, and hence claims 10-14 are not anticipated by Senpuku for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 9 is not anticipated by Senpuku.

Claim 16 recites combinations of features of independent claim 15, and hence claim 16 is not anticipated by Senpuku for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 15 is not anticipated by Senpuku.

Claims 2-8, 10-14 and 16 recite additional features, which, in combination with the features of the claims upon which they depend, are not anticipated by Senpuku

For example, Senpuku does not disclose "switching circuitry for selectably switching an output signal from said graphics engine to the corresponding ones of said driver circuits" as recited in claim 2. The Examiner cites paragraph [0056] of Senpuku as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Senpuku instead discloses that the MPU 1 performs a key-input receiving process for the operation button 6. [0056]. Senpuku further discloses that signals from the operation button 8 are read from I/O controller 6. [0056]. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses switching circuitry for selectably switching an output signal from a graphics engine to the corresponding ones of the driver circuits. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 2, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 2. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants respectfully assert that Senpuku does not disclose "wherein said switching circuitry switches said signals for displaying first information to a driver circuit coupled to said first display device and switches signals for displaying second information to a driver circuit coupled to said second display device" as recited in claim 3. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0059-0062] of Senpuku as disclosing the

above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Senpuku instead discloses that when the MPU 1 detects the action of opening the sub-display device 3b, the MPU 1 automatically selects from the plurality of received e-mails and displays on the sub-display device 3b details of one received e-mail. [0060]. Senpuku further discloses that the user can easily switch from using one screen to using two screens. [0061]. Hence, Senpuku discloses automatically selecting from the plurality of received e-mails an e-mail to be displayed on the sub-display device 3b. Senpuku further discloses that the user can easily switch from using one screen to using two screens. There is no language in the cited passage that disclose switching circuitry that switches the signals for displaying first information to a driver circuit coupled to the first display device and switches signals for displaying second information to a driver circuit coupled to the second display device. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 3, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 3. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "wherein said second display device comprises a flexible organic light emitting diode (OLED) display" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner cites paragraph [0121] of Senpuku as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Senpuku instead discloses that the display device may be configured by arranging a plurality of light emitting diodes, and furthermore, an electroluminescence display or a plasma display panel may also be used. [0121]. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses that the second display device comprises an organic light emitting diode (OLED) display. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 4 and 10, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "wherein said first information is generated by a first, user-selected source, and said second information is selected by a second, user-selected source" as recited in claim 8 and similarly in claim 14. The Examiner cites Figure 13 of Senpuku as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Figure 13 illustrates a flowchart representing a video conversation screen-switching process. [0085]. There is no language in the

description of Figure 13 that discloses that the first information is generated by a first, user-selected source, and that the second information is selected by a second, user-selected source. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 8 and 14, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claims 8 and 14. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Senpuku does not disclose "detecting a low-battery condition in the portable device; and switching the display skin from to a third, predetermined display data source in response to the low-battery condition" as recited in claim 16. The Examiner cites paragraph [0101] of Senpuku as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (10/31/2006), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Senpuku instead discloses that when the flag is "2", since there has been a change to closed status, the MPU 1 sets a back-light power supply for the sub-display device 3b to OFF. [0101]. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses detecting a low-battery condition in the portable device. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that disclose switching the display skin from to a third, predetermined display data source in response to the low-battery condition. Thus, Senpuku does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 16, and thus Senpuku does not anticipate claim 16. M.P.E.P. §2131.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that not each and every claim limitation was found within Senpuku, and thus claims 1-16 are not anticipated by Senpuku. M.P.E.P. §2131.

II. CONCLUSION:

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1-16 in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an allowance of such claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,159

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, TX 75201
(512) 370-2832

Austin_1 332677v.1